

SIMILARITY OF CRITICISMS VISITED UPON
WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, AND WILSON

SPEECH

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 12, 1920



WASHINGTON

1920

173732—20681



SPEECH

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR.

SIMILARITY OF CRITICISMS VISITED UPON WASHINGTON, LINCOLN,
AND WILSON.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have noticed this, Mr. President, from my historical reading, that President Wilson is not the only President of the United States who has accomplished great things for his country who has been assailed in his lifetime by political and other kinds of opponents. Even Theodore Roosevelt was assailed, and he was one of the greatest of Americans. But to-day I am going to refer specifically only to two illustrious examples in our country's history. I am going to refer to the career of Mr. Washington and the career of Mr. Lincoln, one of whom served two terms and another served a term and a part of a term. Both of these Presidents, as much as we revere their memories to-day, were assailed during their terms of office, just as President Wilson is being assailed to-day; and I want to call the attention of the Senate and the country to some of the infamously false charges then made against the Father of his Country and our martyred President.

I am reading from an article recently published by Mr. Theodore Price, of New York City, and from time to time may make comments upon Mr. Price's article.

The vociferous vigor with which Woodrow Wilson is now being assailed as an "usurper" by some who disagree with him recalls the attacks that were made on Washington and Lincoln, both of whom were also reviled as "usurpers." Perhaps it may reassure those who are at times disturbed by the bitterness of the President's opponents to read again the story of the malignant attacks that his two great predecessors had to meet as they led the Nation through previous crises in its history.

Curiously enough Senator LODGE, who is one of the chief antagonists of the administration, wrote a "Life of Washington," in which he deals at length with what his detractors had to say of the Father of his Country. He says:

In his lifetime Washington had his enemies and detractors in abundance. During the Revolution he was abused and intrigued against, thwarted and belittled, to a point which posterity in general scarcely realizes. Final and conclusive victory brought an end to this, and he passed to the Presidency amid a general acclaim. Then the attacks began again. Their character has been shown in a previous chapter, but they were of no real moment except as illustrations of the existence and meaning of party divisions. The ravings of Bache and Freneau, and the coarse insults of Giles, were all totally unimportant in themselves. They merely define the purposes and character of the party which opposed Washington, and but for him would be forgotten. Among his eminent contemporaries, Jefferson and Pickering, bitterly opposed in all things else, have left memoranda and letters reflecting upon the abilities of their former chief. Jefferson disliked him because he blocked his path,

but with habitual caution he never proceeded beyond a covert sneer, implying that Washington's mental powers, at no time very great, were impaired by age during his Presidency, and that he was easily deceived by practiced intriguers. Pickering, with more boldness, set Washington down as commonplace, not original in his thought, and vastly inferior to Hamilton, apparently because he was not violent, and did not make up his mind before he knew the facts.

Then, telling of the Democratic opposition to the treaty with Great Britain negotiated by Washington in 1795, LODGE says:

Their (the Democratic) orators did not hesitate to say that the conduct of the President in this affair had been improper and monarchical and that he ought to be impeached.

After the treaty had been signed a New York newspaper, the *Aurora*, declared that the President had violated the Constitution, and made a treaty with a nation abhorred by our people; that he answered the respectful remonstrances of Boston and New York as if he were the omnipotent director of a seraglio, and had thundered contempt upon the people with as much confidence as if he sat upon the throne of Industan.

How similar, Mr. President, are the maledictions that are being hurled at President Wilson by Senators in this body and by representatives of the press in this country.

Commenting on this, Senator LODGE says:

It is not probable that the writer of the brilliant diatribe just quoted had any very distinct idea about either seraglios or "Industan," but he, and others of like mind, probably took pleasure in the words, as did the old woman who always loved to bear Mesopotamia mentioned. Other persons, however, were more definite in their statements. John Beckley, who had once been Clerk of the House, writing under the very opposite signature of "A Calm Observer," declared that Washington had been overdrawn his salary in defiance of law, and had actually stolen in this way \$4,750—

How like a speech that we not long ago listened to right in this body on the other side of the aisle! The more recent speech against Wilson sounds almost like a plagiarism—

Such being the case, the "Calm Observer" very naturally inquired: "What will posterity say of the man who has done this thing? Will it not say that the mask of political hypocrisy has been worn by Caesar, by Cromwell, and by Washington?"

Again, how like another description of President Wilson recently uttered in this body:

Another patriot, also of the Democratic Party, declared that the President had been false to a republican Government. He said that Washington maintained the seclusion of a monk and the supercilious distance of a tyrant, and that the concealing carriage drawn by super-numerary horses expressed the will of the President and defined the loyal duty of the people.

Again, I say, how like the expressions that are used about Woodrow Wilson almost daily in this body. Some of them might have been copied from these statements made against George Washington.

In February, 1796, 13 months before Washington's retirement, the House of Representatives refused to adjourn on his birthday for half an hour, in order to go and pay him their respects, as had been the pleasant custom up to that time. The Democrats of that day were in no confusion of mind as to the party to which Washington belonged and they did not hesitate to put this deliberate slight upon him in order to make their dislike apparent. This was not the action of a partisan mob, but the well-considered procedure of the representatives of a party in Congress, and on March 6, 1797, two days after Washington's

final retirement from the Presidency, the *Aurora* printed the following editorial:

This is written of Washington, not of Wilson.

"Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace," was the pious ejaculation of a pious man who beheld a flood of happiness rushing in upon mankind. . . . If ever there was a time that would license the reiteration of the ejaculation, that time has now arrived, for the man who is the source of all the misfortune of our country is this day reduced to a level with his fellow citizens and is no longer possessed of power to multiply evils upon the United States. If ever there was a period for rejoicing, this is the moment. Every heart in unison with the freedom and happiness of the people ought to beat high with exultation that the name of Washington ceases from this day to give currency to political insults and to legalize corruption. A new era is now opening upon us, an era which promises much to the people, for public measures must now stand upon their own merits, and nefarious projects can no longer be supported by a name. When a retrospect has been taken of the Washingtonian administration for eight years it is a subject of the greatest astonishment that a single individual should have cinkered the principles of republicanism in an enlightened people just emerged from the gulf of despotism, and should have carried his designs against the public liberty so far as to have put in jeopardy its very existence. Such, however, are the facts, and with these staring us in the face, the day ought to be a jubilee in the United States.

Commenting upon this editorial, Senator LODGE says:

This was not the outburst of a single malevolent spirit. The article was copied and imitated in New York and Boston and wherever the party that called Jefferson leader had a representative among the newspapers. It is not probable that stuff of this sort gave Washington himself a moment's anxiety—

I might stop here long enough to say not more anxiety than stuff of the same sort is now causing President Wilson in the White House—

for he knew too well what he had done, and he was too sure of his own hold upon the hearts of the people to be in the least disturbed by the attacks of hostile editors. But the extracts are of interest as showing that the opposition party of that time, the party organized and led by Jefferson, regarded Washington as their worst enemy, and assailed him and slandered him to the utmost. They even went so far as to borrow materials from the enemies of the country with whom we had lately been at war by publishing the forged letters attributed to Washington, and circulated by the British in 1777, in order to discredit the American general. One of Washington's last acts, on March 3, 1797, was to file in the State Department a solemn declaration that these letters, then republished by an American political party, were base forgeries of English origin in a time of war.

And in a paragraph which the Senator might perhaps reread with profit to-day he comments upon Washington's unshaken hold upon the masses in the following words:

Yet despite all these attacks there can be no doubt that Washington's hold upon the masses of the people was unshaken. They would have gladly seen him assume the Presidency for the third time, and if the test had been made thousands of men who gave their votes to the opposition would have still supported him for the greatest office in their gift. But this time Washington would not yield to the wishes of his friends or of the country. He felt that he had done his work and earned the rest and the privacy for which he longed above all earthly things. In September, 1796, he published his farewell address, and no man ever left a nobler political testament. Through much tribulation he had done his great part in establishing the Government of the Union, which might easily have come to naught without his commanding influence. He had imparted to it the dignity of his own great character. He had sustained the splendid financial policy of Hamilton. He had struck a fatal blow at the colonial spirit in our politics, and had lifted up our foreign policy to a plane worthy of an independent nation. He had stricken off the fetters which impeded the march of western settlement, and without loss of honor had gained time to enable our institutions to harden and become strong. He had made peace with our most dangerous enemies, and, except in the case of France, where there

were perilous complications to be solved by his successor, he left the United States in far better and more honorable relations with the rest of the world than even the most sanguine would have dared to hope when the Constitution was formed.

I am going to stop here long enough to say that the same could be said of President Wilson, who is being so bitterly assailed to-day, for it was under his leadership that the United States has won the greatest war in all the history of time. It is under his leadership that the United States to-day is enjoying the greatest prosperity not only that this country has ever enjoyed but that any civilized country under the sun has ever enjoyed, and we all know it. It was under his leadership that there was enacted the greatest banking system that was ever established in all the world, sufficient not only to finance us in the most expensive war we have ever known but sufficient to finance the world. You Republicans had been trying for 50 years to establish such a system and had utterly failed.

You can take our merchants and they are making more profits in the last seven years than ever before in their lives. You can take our laboring men in the last seven years and they have made more wages than in any seven years in their entire lives. You can take our farmers and they have gotten more for their products than ever before in the same period. You can take our banks and other business institutions and they have been more prosperous than ever before. The whole country has never had such prosperity as it has had in the last seven years, and the only offense Mr. Wilson has committed is that he has been at the head of the Government while this has been going on. He ought to be crucified for giving to America her greatest prosperity!

In his life of Washington Sparks tells much the same story, and Washington Irving confirms it in his biography, but it is related in greatest detail in the chapter on "Slanderers of Washington" that is to be found in McMaster's History of the People of the United States in the volume covering Washington's administrations.

Those who are shocked by the virulence with which President Wilson is being attacked to-day should read this chapter. They will be comforted, for Washington was accused time and time again not only of violating the Constitution and trying to set up an autocracy and an aristocracy but of "debauching the country," "seeking a crown," and "trying to pass himself off as an honest man."

One libeler took great pains to prove that the President had committed murder. Benjamin Franklin Bache reprinted a series of letters which many years before had been forged and published under Washington's name. Bache says that when Fort Lee surrendered a mulatto servant of Gen. Washington fell into the hands of the British. With him came a portmanteau, and in the portmanteau were seven letters. Some were addressed to Mr. Lund Washington, some to John Parke Custis, and one to Mrs. Washington. In them Washington was represented as looking on the cause of the Colonies as hopeless and lost. Both the story and the letters were false. The servant had never for a moment been in British hands. Not one of the letters had come from the general's pen. Yet now, after 19 years of oblivion, the slander was again spread before the country. Washington was deeply hurt, and as the 4th of March approached drew up and placed in the hands of the Secretary of State a solemn declaration that not one of the letters was his.

Meantime Thomas Paine, famous as an infidel and the author of the "Rights of Man," had fled to France, where he joined in

the French Revolution and entertained himself the while by writing pamphlets attacking Washington as chiefly inspired by "a sort of nondescribable, chameleon-colored thing called prudence," which was in many cases a substitute for principle and indistinguishable from hypocrisy. He alleged that "once in the presidential office the natural ingratitude of Washington's character appeared, and that he assumed the merit of everything to himself, swallowed the grossest adulation, traveled America from end to end to put himself in the way of receiving it, had in his chest as many addresses as James II, and had supported monopolies of every kind from the moment his administration began." The gist of this attack was given in one sentence:

And as for you, sir, treacherous in private friendship (for so you have been to me, and that in the day of danger), and a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an imposter; whether you have abandoned good principles or whether you ever had any.

Those words were spoken by Thomas Paine of the man whom the whole world reveres to-day.

But the attacks upon Washington were mild when compared with those of which Abraham Lincoln was the object. On the floor of Congress he was again and again assailed as a "tyrant," "a usurper," and "a despot as absolute as the Czars of Russia."

Again, we find the words that are being so commonly used to-day against President Wilson by those who would defame him. Senator after Senator charged that for much less arbitrary acts Kings of England and France had lost their heads. One of them termed Lincoln "the most weak and imbecile man" he had ever met. I am quoting from history about Lincoln. I am not quoting from speeches of Senators on this floor about Wilson. One of them termed Lincoln "the most weak and imbecile man" he had ever met. Benjamin R. Curtis, a former justice of the United States Supreme Court, described Lincoln's powers as "a military despotism" (Curtis pamphlet on Executive Power, Oct. 18, 1862), and Joel Parker, a former chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Hampshire, wrote, November 1, 1862, that—

The President is not only a monarch, but that he is an absolute, irresponsible, uncontrollable Government; a perfect military despotism.

I stop here long enough to wonder whether the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who was assailing the President for alleged physical and mental disability the other day, did not copy in substance some of the language that was here used about Abraham Lincoln. It sounds very much like him. Is it possible that even illness will not soften the bitter malice of partisanship? A foreign observer, Schleiden, wrote to Charles Sumner:

One of the most interesting features of the present state of things is the illimited power exercised by the Government. Mr. Lincoln is, in that respect, the equal, if not the superior, of Louis Napoleon. The difference consists only in the fact that the President rests his authority on the unanimous consent of the people of the loyal States, the Emperor his on the army. (Rhodes's History of the United States, III, p. 442.)

And I am reminded of another speech in the Senate, which undertook to show that President Wilson was not honest. I call the attention of our friends to this letter of September 23, 1864.

On September 23, 1864, under the heading "Is Mr. Lincoln Honest?" the New York World printed the following editorial:

The greatest claim of Mr. Lincoln to the confidence and support of the people has been his reputation for honesty. Strip him of this and there is nothing left but vacillation, imbecility, and obscene jesting. Will this claim of honesty bear examination? The very prefix of "honest" to a man's name indicates that he will bear watching. Robespierre caused himself to be called "the incorruptible." Henry Clay said that "Honest John Davis" (of Massachusetts) meant "Canny John Davis." What does it mean with Mr. Lincoln? Let us look at Mr. Lincoln's honesty. He held on to Secretary Cameron until compelled by public indignation to remove him. Secretary Floyd was a pigmy to Mr. Cameron in speculation. And yet Mr. Lincoln, knowing all about Cameron, sent him to Russia, compelling the Emperor (the only potentate in Europe who had been our friend) to consort with this disgraced Cabinet minister. Moreover, the President sent his own private carriage to take this ex-Secretary to the White House and offered to send him to Russia in a frigate when the *Nashville* was committing her depredations and we had not successfully blockaded a single southern port. Furthermore, Mr. Cameron is now managing the Pennsylvania election for Mr. Lincoln and disbursing the secret-service fund. If Mr. Lincoln is "honest," why has he taken such pains to give to his personal friends letters to generals commanding departments ordering them by his signature to permit these friends to go whither they choose and to get out what cotton they can?

I digress long enough to say that I resent this base calumny upon the fame of Mr. Lincoln. I am a southern man; born with all the prejudices, perhaps, of a southern man, for I belong to the old régime; but say to you now, in all honesty and fairness, that such a statement about the President of the United States at that time—Mr. Lincoln—is one of the basest and most awful calumnies that was ever uttered out of the mouth of man. It is not baser, however, than some of the utterances which have been made against Mr. Wilson recently, which are just as entirely without foundation. Must true greatness ever be the victim of malicious abuse? I continue to read:

If Mr. Lincoln is "honest," why has he, for friends of worse than doubtful reputation, requested contracts and special trading privileges?

If Mr. Lincoln is "honest," why has Master "Bob" Lincoln had a share in the profits of Senator _____'s and Senator _____'s cotton expeditions, whereby he has been enabled to outshine shoddy itself at Saratoga this summer?

I am again reminded of a speech made in the Senate not long ago in reference to the President's shining in Paris; and the one statement is just as baseless and inaccurate as is the other.

If Mr. Lincoln is "honest," why does he pay himself his salary in gold certificates when other creditors have to content themselves with depreciated greenbacks?

If Mr. Lincoln is "honest," why was the McKinstry court-martial dissolved immediately after the evidence had traced \$90,000 into the hands of a female relative of Mr. Lincoln's sister? Did our "honest" President fear lest the public might push the inquiries nearer home?

How can an American citizen thus write about a great man like Lincoln, false and untrue as every one of us knows such statements to be? And false and untrue as they were, so are the statements which are now being made about the present President of the United States in like manner false and untrue.

The President went himself, as was his right and duty to do, and negotiated the best peace terms he could get. His voice and his influence and his power were always on the side of the just and right. All the world acclaimed him as the unselfish and just arbitrator in every settlement

at the peace table. The whole world, except a majority of 1 in the United States Senate, was willing to accept his decisions as to fair dealing between nations. And yet this majority in the Senate, as I believe being moved more by partisanship than by patriotism, has for nearly a year been fighting this just settlement and abusing this just man simply because he is a Democrat and not a Republican. In my judgment, if a Republican had negotiated this treaty every one of the 49 Republicans would have been for it, irreconcilables and all.

This was followed on the 1st of October of the same year with another editorial attack under the caption "The ambitious buffoon," in which the man so revered to-day is thus assailed:

Some time ago we took occasion to say that Mr. Lincoln was a buffoon, whereat mightily shocked were the sweet-mouthed Republican organs. We brought forward some evidence that Lincoln is a buffoon, and have ever since waited for a reply. Here it is again. Will somebody undertake its rebuttal?

If to prove publicly therefore now in this crisis of our politics and of the Nation's fortunes, that Mr. Lincoln is a buffoon—that is, "a person who makes sport by low jests"—will prevent any number of votes, no matter how few, from being cast for his reelection, then that proof is a public duty; and mere questions of decorum must stand aside as trivial and untimely.

How like the statements that are being constantly hurled at the sick President of the United States to-day! Men have no mercy in their souls for the man who has given to America the very leading place among all the nations of the earth. When we went into the war under the leadership of Mr. Wilson we were admittedly in the third place among the nations; to-day we are in the first place; and yet Americans who claim to be patriotic are devoting the most of their time and their talents to abusing and traducing the man who is more responsible for our success in the late war than is any other man in the country. While we were in the war Mr. Wilson was the greatest of leaders and patriots. No one applauded him more than our Republican friends. All he did while the war was going on was in their eyes exactly right. They got into power in 1918 by saying they had supported him more loyally than the Democrats. But as soon as the war was over, in the twinkling of an eye all this was changed, and Mr. Wilson became the worst man in the world. The truth is they do not believe this themselves in their hearts. But I proceed further.

And now for the proof that Mr. Lincoln is a buffoon, we appeal to every man of good sense and intelligence whom public or private duties have taken to the White House frequently during the last three years.

We appeal to all the gentlemen on the Republican side of the United States Senate.

We appeal to that Republican Senator whose self-respect would not permit him to stay in Mr. Lincoln's presence and hear from his lips the language which he was there compelled to hear.

We appeal to the 150 clergymen who went in a body to the East Room, in order to present to Mr. Lincoln the resolution of one of the largest and most respectable religious denominations.

We appeal to the eminent divine who was deputed to make their address, and who has publicly and repeatedly pronounced the President's deportment on the occasion the deportment of a "buffoon and a gawk," so sickening in its offensiveness, and so humiliating to his patriotic pride, as to have made him quite despair of the fortunes of a Republic whose helm is in such hands.

We appeal to the gentlemen on the Republican side of the House of Representatives. Let the Tribune ask them what is the fact.

We appeal to the blackguards there—for such there are on that floor, though few—whose staple of talk in their midnight orgies is the low

and obscene stories daily retailed to them in the chamber of the Chief Magistrate.

We appeal to the gentlemen who fêted Mr. Lincoln here and escorted him to the clubs when he last visited New York.

We appeal to that eminent Republican who left the room where the future President was recounting some experiences of his earlier life rather than that his ears should be defiled with the echoes of such filthiness.

We appeal to the staff officers who galloped behind the President when he visited the battle field of Antietam, and who increased their distance from him rather than listen longer to the low nigger song of "Picayune Butler" which Mr. Lincoln called on Marshal Lamon to sing as he rode among the fresh graves and trenches where were buried the 10,000 dead soldiers of the Republic.

A series of editorials in the same paper, which was then supporting Gen. McClellan for the Presidency, were headed "Mr. Lincoln—has he or has he not an interest in the profits of public contracts?" The question was answered affirmatively—by implication, at least—and followed by a final fling at him as responsible for the high prices then ruling in the following:

If Mr. Lincoln's three years' misrule has run up the price of coal to \$15; flour, \$16; butter, 60 cents; coffee, 60 cents; clothing to five times its former price—and everything that the people eat, drink, and wear in a similar proportion—what will be their prices if Mr. Lincoln is re-elected? Under McClellan and a Democratic administration the people will once more be able to live as in times past, on cheap coal, cheap flour, cheap coffee, cheap clothing, and cheap everything that they want. In other words, \$1 of real money will buy as much as \$4 of greenbacks.

At the Democratic national convention in Chicago McClellan was nominated for the Presidency. Many of the speakers were absolutely unrestrained in the violence with which they attacked Lincoln. S. S. Cox, later nicknamed "Sunset," delivered an address in which he said:

Abraham Lincoln has deluged the country with blood, created a debt of four thousand million dollars, and sacrificed 2,000,000 of human lives. At the November election we will damn him with eternal infamy. Even Jefferson Davis is no greater enemy of the Constitution.

A Michigan Congressman named John Fuller asked:

Are you willing to follow in the footsteps of Abraham Lincoln, the perjured wretch who has violated the oath he took before high heaven to support the Constitution and preserve the liberties of the people?

Congressman Stambaugh, of Ohio, declared:

You might search hell over and find none worse than Abraham Lincoln.

And the Hon. Henry Clay Deam, of Iowa, made an oration from which the following quotation is taken:

The American people are ruled by felons. With all his vast armies Lincoln has failed, failed, failed.

I pause here long enough to hear the cry that is being raised to-day by our Republican friends that we failed in the war—that England really won it, or that France really won it. What kind of Americans have our friends become? There have been, I think, 67 investigating committees appointed by this Republican Congress to see if they could not find 15 cents somewhere that had been misspent in the prosecution of the war, and I understand they have already expended more than \$2,000,000 in the vain endeavor to find out some mistake of the administration at whose head is President Wilson. Do you really think that the American people are going to pay any attention to the little mistakes that were made in the prosecution of the war? If you do, you are going to be woefully mistaken. Of course we made mistakes. But we won the war! Is that not enough? And we won it under the leadership of President Wilson; and

all your efforts to take from him the credit will prove in vain. But I continue:

And still the monster usurper wants more victims for his slaughter pens. I blush that such a felon should occupy the highest gift of the people. Perjury and larceny are written all over him. Ever since the usurper, traitor, and tyrant has occupied the presidential chair the Republican Party has shouted war to the knife, and the knife to the hilt. Blood has flowed in torrents, and yet the thirst of the old monster is not quenched. His cry is ever for more blood.

Horace Greeley's petulant faultfinding with Lincoln in the columns of the Tribune will be recalled by all students of the history of the Civil War and need not be reprinted. The editor of the Tribune continued these attacks until the President finally silenced him with his famous letter of August 22, 1862.

Now, I wish to read what Mr. Lincoln himself said in answer to these infamous traducers of his. This letter is written, I believe, to Mr. Greeley, although it is not so stated:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, August 22, 1862.

DEAR SIR: I have just read yours of the 19th addressed to myself to the New York Tribune. If there be in it any statements or assumptions of fact which I may know to be erroneous, I do not now and here controvert them.

He was silent under them. He knew what he had done for this country, he knew these attacks were false, and he says, "Though I may know that they are false, I do not controvert them."

If there be in it any inferences which I may believe to be falsely drawn, I do not now and here argue against them. If there be perceptible in it any impatient and dictatorial tone, I waive it in deference to an old friend whose heart I have always supposed to be right.

This is the man, Senators, who was abused as a "low, obscene buffoon" by men whose memories have long since faded into insignificance or have been buried by the dust of oblivion.

As to the policy I "seem to be pursuing," as you say, I have not meant to leave anyone in doubt.

I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored, the nearer the Union will be "the Union as it was." If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time save slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time destroy slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery.

If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all of the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do less whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do more whenever I shall believe doing more will help the cause. I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views as fast as they shall appear to be true views.

I have here stated my purpose according to my view of official duty; and I intend no modification of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere could be free.

Yours,

A. LINCOLN.

It is, however, worth remarking that it was not until after Gettysburg, when the war had been really won, that the cabal against Lincoln took organized form and the opposition to the man who had saved the Union became most venomous and bitter.

And so it is that after the greatest World War that ever took place has been won, we find the greatest bitterness, the greatest reproach, the greatest abuse hurled at the man who was our leader during that war. For shame, Senators on both sides of the aisle! Can we afford to let partisanship lead us further to such lengths?

On August 5, 1864, Benjamin F. Wade, of Ohio, Republican leader of the Senate, and Henry Winter Davis, one of the Republican leaders of the House, issued the following manifesto to the people:

The supporters of the administration are responsible to the country for its conduct and it is their right and duty to check the encroachments of the Executive on the authority of Congress and to require it to confine itself to its proper sphere.

Oh, how often has that been repeated in the 15 months of debate we have had about this treaty, almost daily—that the President was usurping some function that he was not entitled to perform; that he was violating some provision of the Constitution. Where is the provision that he has violated? Who has ever presented the facts, and what provision of the Constitution has Woodrow Wilson ever violated? Who will point it out? We know he has violated none, but, like Lincoln, he has been standing for his country first, last, and at all times, and has faithfully and patriotically performed every duty.

A more studied outrage—

Listen to this! We have heard this, too, in this very Chamber for 15 months:

A more studied outrage on the legislative authority of the people has never been perpetrated.

The President has greatly presumed on the forbearance which the supporters of his administration have so long practiced, in view of the arduous conflict in which we are engaged.

And I want to speak to my colleagues on this side of the Chamber as well as to our friends on the other side. They say that they are forbearing toward the President. I fear some of them are not. I fear they are too critical. He is your leader. He is the head of your party. He is the head of an administration of which you are a part. Let us uphold him. His administration will be indorsed by our forthcoming convention. It ought to be indorsed. It has accomplished great things for our beloved country. We detract from those great things by not standing by our leader.

But he must understand that our support is of a cause and not of a man; that the authority of Congress is paramount and must be respected.

If he wishes our support, he must confine himself to his executive duties—to obey and execute—not to make the laws.

The specific act that provoked this outburst was Lincoln's refusal to sign a reconstruction bill which would have imposed very harsh and inhumane terms upon the South. He persisted in his refusal nevertheless, and he lived to rejoice in the generosity with which Gen. Grant treated the leaders of the Confederacy when they surrendered to him at Appomattox on the 9th of April, 1865. Five days later Lincoln was assassinated, and now he is canonized.

The record is one which the critics of the President will do well to ponder; for, though Washington and Lincoln are immortal, much research has been necessary to identify their detractors.

Mr. President, I have read this article for the purpose of showing that the vilification and abuse that is now being leveled at the President of the United States is no new thing in American politics. They did it to Washington in his day and they did it to Lincoln in his day; and I say, in the words of the writer of this article, that the names of Washington and Lincoln are immortal, whereas no man except the student knows to-day who their detractors were. In the audience that is here I doubt if there is a single one who can remember offhand the name of a single detractor of either one of those great Presidents of the United States. And so, in my judgment, when the final account is taken, it will be found that Woodrow Wilson, just as Washington did in his day and as Lincoln did in his day, rose to the full height and majesty of an American citizen, and has done only those things and has stood only for those measures that meant the glory and the prosperity and the happiness of our beloved Republic.

APPENDIX.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want here to refer to the remarks of my distinguished friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who read into the RECORD a telegram received from the Louisville Courier-Journal advising us Democrats to surrender and accept the Lodge reservations.

Mr. THOMAS. I assume the Senator from Tennessee got one also?

Mr. McKELLAR. I got one also. I materially differ from the Senator from Colorado in reference to his views on that telegram, and right here and now I am going to read my reply. It is as follows:

MARCH 12, 1920.

COURIER-JOURNAL,
Louisville, Ky.:

Telegram received. Democrats on bipartisan committee engaged in an endeavor to compromise offered everything except surrender on article 10, and their offers were refused. Republicans insist that the obligation of article 10 be destroyed, and are willing to ratify only on its destruction. This is the only article which makes the league really effective in enforcing peace. Everybody knows this. I believe it would be better for us not to be in the league than to destroy the obligation of article 10. The whole world knows that President Wilson and his friends in the Senate are for the league, and the whole world knows that a large majority of the Republicans in the Senate are against the league and that their so-called reservations nullify it. The issue before the people, therefore, will be plain. Generally speaking, those who believe in the league will vote the Democratic ticket and those who are against the league will vote the Republican ticket. A cleaner-cut issue can not be had. The people are not going to be misled into a controversy over reservations. They will understand, as we all do, that the purpose of these reservations was to strangle the peace pact which President Wilson had made and to kill America's influence in the league, and that they were put forward by the enemies of the league and not by its friends. I was on the bipartisan committee and intensely desirous of compromise. I would compromise now, so anxious am I to see the treaty and league ratified, but I shall not surrender to those who would make the league a vain thing and America's participation in it a mockery. The Republicans are in absolute control of the Senate. They have been talking against the league for nearly 15 months. Everybody knows that if they had really wanted to ratify it, it would have been ratified long since, inasmuch as nearly all the Democrats have been for it all the time.

That telegram, Mr. President, in answer to the Courier-Journal, gives my views about this matter.

173732—20681

71.2009.084.04471

